

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 15 and 25 have been amended to replace the word “field” with -industry- to more clearly define the claimed invention.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 10-13 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0091990 (“Little”). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because Little fails to disclose every feature of independent claims 1 and 26.

Claims 1-4 and 10-13

The applicant submits that Little fails to disclose the recited “blueprint” and “documentation” features of claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 recites, in part:

selecting a blueprint from a plurality of blueprints, wherein each of said plurality of blueprints comprises information *relating to a particular industry*, said blueprint being selected *based on a first industry in which the enterprise operates*;
[and]...

providing documentation within at least one functional component, *wherein the documentation specifies a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components*;

(emphasis added). Little does not disclose these features.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Little discloses a software plug-in that assists a software developer in designing and constructing software applications using Uniform Modeling Language (UML) object modeling. The Office Action points to paragraphs [0098], [0124], [0242] and [0387], as well as claim 21, as allegedly teaching blueprints having information that relates to a particular industry (*See Office Action*, pp. 2-3). While these paragraphs discuss UML modeling techniques, and a plurality of UML models, they do not mention anything that could be construed as disclosing blueprints that include information that “relates to a particular industry” as claimed. As noted in the present application at, for example, paragraphs [0036] and [0037], a blueprint may be tailored to the particular industry in which the enterprise is operating. The cited portions of Little do not disclose this type of

industry-specific tailoring. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Little for at least this reason.

With respect to the claimed feature of “providing documentation,” the Office Action points to paragraphs [0130] and [0145] of Little as allegedly teaching the recited feature. (Office Action, p. 3). However, claim 1 recites that the provided “documentation specifies *a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components*” (emphasis added). Little does not disclose this aspect of the invention.

Paragraph [0145] of Little actually discusses a “use case” diagram that a developer may produce to solve a problem by way of programming. For example, Little explains that use cases are diagrams that are part of the initial design process for automating a process: “A use case diagram provides a functional specification of a system and its major processes, and describes the problem that needs to be solved.” This paragraph says nothing about documentation that “specifies a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components,” as claimed. Nor does paragraph [0130] provide such a teaching. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the portions of Little that disclose the recited feature be pointed out with more specificity.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that Little fails to disclose both “blueprints compris[ing] information *relating to a particular industry*” and “providing ... documentation [that] specifies *a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components*.” Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over Little. Inasmuch as claims 2-4 and 10-13 depend from claim 1, the applicant submits that they too are patentable for the same reasons. Reconsideration of the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 and 10-13 is respectfully requested.

Claim 26

The applicant submits that Little also fails to disclose all of the “artifacts” recited in claim 26. At a minimum, Little fails to disclose “a vision and operations model for said given business” and “an infrastructure model for said given business.”

First, as defined in the specification, a “vision and operations model” includes artifacts that describe items such as “parties external to the industry,” “parties internal to the industry,” “industry trends,” “business environment,” “business vision and strategy,” “information needs and business data structures,” “organizational structure,” “business locations” and “business events and results” (Spec., ¶¶ [0068] and [0072]). The Office Action refers to paragraph [0129] of Little as teaching this type of artifact, but it does not. Paragraph [0129] describes something called a “Static Model” that does not appear to have any relation to the claimed “vision and operations model.”

Second, as defined in the specification, an “infrastructure model” comprises “[k]ey business functions implemented as a set [of] architectural models (UML) representing core business services” (Spec., ¶ [0071]). The Office Action refers to paragraphs [0151] – [0156] as teaching this type of artifact, but again that is incorrect. Paragraphs [0151] – [0156] describe a “design phase” of Little’s process and do not appear to have any relation to an “infrastructure model” as claimed.

Because Little fails to disclose at least both “a vision and operations model for said given business” and “an infrastructure model for said given business,” as recited in claim 26, the claim patentably defines over Little. Reconsideration of the Section 102(e) rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-9 and 14-25 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little in view of US Patent No. 6,223,343 (Hopwood). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Little and Hopwood fails to teach or otherwise suggest every feature of independent claims 15 and 25.

Claims 5-9 and 14

Claims 5-9 and 14 depend from claim 1, which has been demonstrated above to be patentable over Little. Hopwood does not cure the deficiencies of Little discussed above. Consequently, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9 and 14 are patentable for the same reasons as presented above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 15-25

Independent claim 15 recites, in pertinent part:

receiving a selection of a blueprint from a plurality of blueprints, each of said plurality of blueprints comprising first information that *relates to a particular industry*, said blueprint being selected *based on a first industry in which an enterprise operates*;

...

providing documentation of the software-based solution *based on at least one of said second information and said third information, wherein the documentation specifies a traceable relationship between at least two elements of the one or more functional components*.

(emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 25 recites, in pertinent part:

providing a plurality of blueprints, each of said plurality of blueprints comprising first information that *relates to a particular industry*;

...

recording documentation within one of the functional components, *wherein the documentation specifies a traceable relationship between the one or more functional components*.

(emphasis added). Neither Little nor Hopwood teaches or suggests these features, alone or in combination.

With respect to the claimed “plurality of blueprints, each ... comprising first information that *relates to a particular industry*” in both claims 15 and 25, the Office Action points to paragraph [0145] as disclosing this feature. It does not. Paragraph [0145] discusses “Use case diagrams,” but does not appear to mention anything that could be construed as disclosing blueprints that include information that “relates to a particular industry” as claimed. As noted in the present application at, for example, paragraphs [0036] and [0037], a

blueprint may be tailored to the particular industry in which the enterprise is operating. The cited portion of Little does not disclose this type of industry-specific tailoring. Nor does Hopwood cure this deficiency of Little. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 25 are patentable over both Little and Hopwood, alone or in combination, for at least this reason.

In addition, neither Little nor Hopwood teaches or suggests the “documentation” features of claims 15 and 16. Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that Little does not teach that “the documentation specifies *a traceable relationship between at least two elements of the one or more functional components*,” as recited in claim 15, nor the similarly recited feature in claim 25 (*see*, Office Action, pp. 8 and 11, respectively). However, the Office Action asserts that Hopwood teaches these features at column 14, lines 25-30. That is incorrect.

Hopwood describes a “Revision Management System ... that allows developers and data centers to track and control changes to elements throughout the application development life cycle” (col. 12:65 – 13:2). Column 14, lines 25-30 state:

The key to enabling RMS functions is a logical arrangement of the elements to facilitate tracking purposes. Arranging the data in a relational format enables RMS objectives related to grouping and packaging to be implemented effectively and efficiently.

While this portion of Hopwood mentions “tracking,” it presumably refers to tracking of the revisions to elements, as the purpose of the described system is “revision management.” There is no indication whatsoever that the system creates any form of documentation that “specifies a traceable relationship *between at least two elements of one or more functional components*,” as recited in claim 15, nor that “specifies a traceable relationship *between the one or more functional components*,” as recited in claim 16. Without more, Hopwood cannot be said to teach these features, and no combination of Hopwood with Little would produce the claimed invention. Indeed, the applicant disagrees with the Office Action’s assertion that Hopwood represents “an analogous art and similar configuration of providing software based solutions.” The present invention is directed to a system that uses “blueprints” to develop

software-based solutions for enterprises. Hopwood describes a “revision management system”; it has nothing to do with using blueprints to develop software based solutions.

Because Hopwood’s revision management system does not provide documentation that “specifies a traceable relationship *between at least two elements of one or more functional components*,” as recited in claim 15, nor that “specifies a traceable relationship *between the one or more functional components*,” as recited in claim 16, and because the Office Action acknowledges that Little fails to teach these features, the applicant submits that independent claims 15 and 25 patentably define over Little and Hopwood, alone or in combination. Inasmuch as claims 16-24 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 15, the applicant submits that they too patentably define over the cited art for the same reason.

Thus, for all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration of the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 5-9 and 14-25 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Steven B. Samuels at (215) 564-0564, to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: August 2, 2007

/Steven B. Samuels/

Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

Correspondence address:
Richard J. Gregson, Esq.
Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19424-0001